IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE NASHVILLE DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	
Plaintiff,)))
vs.	CASE NO. 3:09-0445 JUDGE WISEMAN/KNOWLES
	JURY DEMAND
JAMES W. CARELL, ROBERT VINING, DIVERSIFIED HEALTH MANAGEMENT, INC. (also known as CAREALL MANAGEMENT, LLC), THE JAMES W. CARELL FAMILY TRUST, CAREALL, INC., VIP HOME NURSING AND REHABILITATION SERVICES, LLC (also known as VIP HOME NURSING AND REHABILITATION SERVICES, INC.), PROFESSIONAL HOME HEALTH CARE, LLC (also known as PROFESSIONAL HOME HEALTH CARE, INC.), and UNIVERSITY HOME HEALTH, LLC (also known as UNIVERSITY HOME HEALTH, INC.),	
Defendants.	,)

ORDER

This matter is before the Court upon Defendants' "Emergency Motion to Preclude the Plaintiff from Improperly Instructing Deponents Not to Answer Questions." Docket No. 136. The Motion seeks "an Order preventing the United States ("Plaintiff") from instructing deponents not to answer questions for reasons other than those contained in Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(c)(2)." *Id.*, p. 1. The Motion refers to previous depositions in which Defendants contend that counsel for the United States has improperly instructed witnesses not to answer questions for

reasons other than those stated in Rule 30(c)(2).

As Defendants correctly state, Rule 30(c)(2) provides in relevant part, "A person may instruct a deponent not to answer only when necessary to preserve a privilege, to enforce a limitation ordered by the court, or to present a motion under Rule 30(d)(3)." The language of Rule 30(c)(2) is clear and unambiguous.

Without considering or ruling upon any previous factual scenarios, the Court observes that all parties are expected to and required to abide by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Therefore, the instant Motion is GRANTED, and Plaintiff shall not improperly instruct deponents not to answer questions for reasons other than those contained in Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(c)(2).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

E. Clifton Knowles

United States Magistrate Judge